

# THE TRUE AMERICAN.

Devoted to Universal Liberty; Gradual Emancipation in Kentucky; Literature; Agriculture; Elevation of Labor. Morally and Politically; Commercial Intelligence, &c. &c.

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY, TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1845.

NUMBER 10.

VOLUME I.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY  
**WILLIAM L. NEALE,**  
On North Main-street, three doors above the corner,  
at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, or Three Dollars if not paid within three months.

Five copies of each number will be furnished to a club at Two Dollars a copy.

From the terms above, any man who has the confidence of his neighbors can act as Agent, retaining Fifty Cents on each subscription, for when five or more names are sent in, they will be put at "club price." (Two Dollars) and the papers will be sent in individual packets to the different offices.

Subscriptions out of Kentucky payable invariably in advance.

ADVERTISING.

One square, or less, three insertions, \$1 50  
For each subsequent insertion, - - - 25  
One square, three months, - - - 4 00  
One square, six months, - - - 7 00  
One square, twelve months, - - - 12 00

No cuts of any kind will be inserted in the paper, unless accompanied by the name of the advertiser, and the name of the State, and the name of the person to whom the paper is to be sent.

Agents for the True American:  
J. S. RANKIN, of Louisville, for the States of Kentucky and Virginia.  
CALVIN HARTSHORN, of Boston, for the six New England States.

FINCH & WELLS, 115, Nassau-Street, New York, for the State of New York.

POETRY.

RUTH.  
BY THOMAS HODG.  
She stood breast high amid the corn,  
Clasped by the golden light of morn,  
Like the sweetest of the Sun,  
Who many a glorious day had won.

On her cheek an autumn blush,  
Deeply ripened—such a blush  
In the midst of brown was born,  
Like red poppies grown with corn.

Round her eyes her tresses fell;  
Which were blackest none could tell;  
But long lashes veiled a light  
That had been seen by all to bright.

And her hat, with shady brim,  
Made her tresses forehead dim;  
Thus she stood amid the stocks,  
Fanning God with sweetest looks.

Sure, I said, heaven did not mean,  
Where I reap, that I should be gleam,  
Lay thy sheaf down and come,  
Share my harvest and my home.

BALLAD.  
Sigh on, and heart, for Love's eclipse  
And Beauty's fairest queen,  
Though 'tis not for my peasant lips  
To tell the tale of love's dream.

A king might lay his sceptre down,  
But I am poor and lowly;  
The sword would wear a golden crown  
That wears in its thought.

The diamonds gleam in her hair,  
Whose radiant beams surround,  
Might bid such humble hopes beware  
The glancing of her eyes.

Yet looking on, I looked too long,  
And if my love was mine;  
Death follows on the heels of wrong,  
And kills the crime within.

Her dress seemed woven of lily leaves,  
It was so pure and fine;  
O lovely woman, with thy weaves,  
But hie thee, hie thee, hie thee, hie thee.

And homely bow must part apart,  
Where gartered princess stand;  
But may I wear my love at heart  
That will be my life band.

Alas! there's far from rusted frieze  
To silk and satin gown,  
But I doubt if God made like degrees  
In earthly hearts and crown.

My father wrought the plow and sown,  
And brought her cheeks to blame,  
And all that's lovely of my birth  
Is my reproach and shame.

'Tis vain to weep—'tis vain to sigh;  
The vain the vain the vain;  
For where her happy pearls do lie,  
My tears may never cease.

Yet when I'm gone, 'tis loveliness  
May say of what I was;  
His love was nobly born and died;  
Though all the rest was dead.

My speech is rude—but speech is weak  
Such love as mine to tell;  
Yet had I words, I dare not speak—  
So, Lady, fare thee well.

I will not wish thy better state,  
Was one of low degree,  
But I must weep that partial Fate  
Made such a churl of me.

proceeding the sentiments of each other, shall find that the ground for the exercise of Christian charity is both wider and firmer than they had apprehended, some good at least will have arisen from this discussion.

In behalf of my brother and myself, I commend the correspondence to the disciples of Christ, both at the North and the South, in the humble hope that it may be the means of directing a calmer, yet earnest attention to this important subject.

F. W. PROVIDENCE, March 18, 1845.

LETTER FROM THE REV. R. FULLER, Editor of the Christian Reflector.

Mr. Editor—

I comply at once, and in as few words as possible, with your request, and state why I do not deny that slavery is a moral evil; and let me request you, once for all, to bear in mind that this is the point affirmed and denied. You say slavery is itself a sin; it is therefore always a sin; a sin and any circumstances; a crime which must involve the criminal in perdition unless he repents; and should be abandoned at once without reference to consequences. This is the abolition doctrine; and at Philadelphia it was reiterated in every variety of phrase; and when even moderate men, men seemingly very kind and calm in private, mounted the rostrum and felt the oratorical affluence, we invariably heard, but arguments, but denunciations of this sort; we were sure to have eternal charges rung on the moral evil of slavery, the sin of slavery, the abominable guilt of slavery,—to be told that the ineffable horrors of slavery, did not admit of discussion, and to be seriously asked what article of the decalogue slavery does not violate. And because the South listened to all this, unchafed and patiently, one or two papers at the north (and I believe the Reflector among them) forgot themselves, and, when the meetings were over, indulged in peans and flourishes which showed they did not comprehend us. Now what I do entreat is, that you will cherish no delusion on this point. Even Dr. Channing censures this conduct of the abolitionists, and says, "They have done wrong, I believe; nor is their wrong to be winked at because done fanatically, or with good intentions; for how much mischief may be wrought with good designs! They have fallen into the common error of enthusiasts, that of exaggerating their object, of feeling that no evil existed but that which they opposed, and as if no guilt could be compared to that of countenancing and upholding it." The tone of their newspapers, as far as I have seen them, has often been fierce, bitter, and abusive. We are willing to weigh reasons, but assertion, and abuse, and blustering, will be heard in silence, because the subject is not to be argued in that style. A correspondent in your last number holds up to me, as a model, the magnanimity of the Northern States in emancipating a few slaves who had become a burden to their owners. We understand this perfectly, and when in a similar condition we will abolish, too. This writer is, however, perfectly blind, if he supposes that the question with us is now about the value of so much slave property only. It regards all kinds of property, all civilization, life itself; and in such a case to employ vituperation is at once a sin and a mistake. My chief hope for the Union is in the conservative power of religion, and the day is not far off when that power will be required in all its stringency. Look at the distracted condition of this land; reflect on the appalling character of a civil war; and if you love the country, or the slave, do not sever the bands which unite the Baptist churches. Compared with slavery, all other topics which now shake and inflame men's passions in these United States, are really trifles. They are only bonfires; but Calcegon burns next, and in that quarter God forbids that Christians should throw the first torches.

If, however, slavery be a sin, surely it is the duty of masters to abolish it, whatever be the result,—this you urge, and this I grant; and this brings me to the single matter in hand, on which I submit to you the following observations.

1st. In affirming what you do, ought it not to give a pious mind pause, that you are brought into direct conflict with the Bible? The Old Testament did sanction slavery. God said, "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be in your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever." And in the Gospels and Epistles, the institution is, to my knowledge, tolerated. I do not now inquire as to the character of this slavery, nor is it important, for you pronounce slavery itself a sin; a sin, therefore, *semper ubique, always, and everywhere, and in all shapes*. I, for my part, have no difficulty, and am in no sort of dilemma here, for I find my Bible condemning the abuses of slavery, but permitting the system itself, in cases where its abrogation would be a greater calamity than its existence. But you—how do you escape the charge of impiety?

2nd. In the remark just made, I supposed, of course, that you admit some sort of slavery to have been allowed in the Old Testament, and suffered by Jesus and his apostles. A man who denies this will deny anything, and only proves how much stronger a passion is than the clearest truth. Both Dr. Channing and Dr. Wayland, with all respectable commentators, yield this point; but if this point be yielded, how can it be maintained that slaveholding is itself a crime? No one can regard the noble president of Brown University with more esteem and affection than I do; from his arguments, however, I am forced to dissent. His position is this: "The moral precepts of the gospel condemn slavery; it is therefore criminal. Yet he admits that neither the Saviour nor his apostles commanded masters to emancipate their slaves; nay, they 'go further,' he adds, 'and prescribe the duties suited to both parties in their present condition;' among which duties, be it remembered, there is not an intimation of manumission, but the whole code contemplates the existence of the relation. Here, then, we have the Author of the gospel, and the inspired propagators of the gospel, and the Holy Spirit, inditing the gospel, all concurring in a practice which was a violation of the entire moral principles of the gospel! And the reason assigned by Dr. Wayland for this is, that a man should be the property of another man; but why is it so monstrous? Simply because you suppose that the word 'property' involves a degradation to the state of a chattel. This, however, is plainly fallacious. Property in its nature is one thing; property in my horse is a very different thing; and property in a slave entirely distinct still. To treat the brute as I might a chair, would be barbarous; and to use the slave as I might a brute, would be just as inhuman as in any society, and draw down the vengeance of laws, human and divine. Property in a slave is only a right to his service without his consent or contract; and if this be necessarily criminal, then the authority of a father over his child, and of a government over its citizens, must be criminal too.

I might easily protract these remarks, but it is unnecessary. Let it be recollected that the only proposition in this abstract assertion, slavery is itself a sin,—always and by necessity a sin; and it appears to me you must either abandon the Bible, or make it teach an expediency and 'keeping back' of truth, which it abhors, or modify your views. The matter stands thus: If the Bible do authorize some sort of slavery; if now the abuses admitted and deplored by me be essentials of all slavery, then the Bible did allow those abuses; if it be impossible that revelation should permit such evils, then you must either reject the Scriptures, as some abolitionists are doing, or concede these sins are only accidents of slavery, which may, and perhaps, in cases of many Christians, do exist without them. Before I dissent from this subject, I would glance at two arguments which are sometimes urged, and require a passing notice.

The first is thus summed up by Dr. Wayland: "The manner in which the duty of servants or slaves is inculcated, therefore, affords no ground for the assertion, that the gospel authorizes one man to hold another in bondage, any more than the command to honor the king, when that king was Nero, authorized the tyranny of the emperor, or that the command to turn the other cheek when one is smitten, justifies the infliction of violence by an injurious man." To this the reply is easy. The gospel does not recognize either Nero or the injurious man as a Christian brother, but it does so recognize those who hold slaves.

The second argument is thus put by Dr. Channing. Polygamy was allowed to the Israelites, was the practice of their holiest men, and was common and licensed in the age of the apostles. But the apostles nowhere condemn it, nor was the renunciation of it made an essential condition of admission into the Christian Church. And of this the sophistry is hardly specious. What if all that is affirmed be granted? It would only prove that polygamy is not sinful, and how is this connected with the matter at issue? But the gospel does forbid and did at once abolish polygamy.

That those who hold slaves are unfit members for a Christian church, is a novel doctrine, a new light, which would have been scouted from our churches fifty years ago. But no polygamist has ever been admitted or tolerated as a Christian since the establishment of Christianity. The Saviour expressly gave a new law as to divorce, and the very letter of that precept, and every word in the epistles as to marriage, recognize and require only one wife. Jesus says, "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marryeth another, committeth adultery." Now what constitutes the adultery? Not "putting away his wife," but "marrying another," therefore, he who marryeth another without putting away his wife, is guilty. Paul says, "For the woman which is a husband, is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband; so then if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress." To avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband." Is not this express enough? Besides, it is a mistake in Dr. Channing and others to suppose that polygamy was common in the days of the Saviour and his apostles. The Roman and Grecian laws did not permit it; and such are the inconveniences and evils of the custom, that it had nearly ceased in Judea, hence, in the whole New Testament not a single instance is even alluded to. No further notice was therefore required than the language of Christ and the directions in the Epistles. But slavery was everywhere a part of the social organization of the earth; and slaves and their masters were members together of the churches; and minute instructions are given to each as to their duties, without even an intimation that it was the duty of masters to emancipate. Now I ask, could this possibly be so, if slavery were a heinous sin? No! every candid man will answer, no! What, then, are we to think of those who revile us as pirates and thieves, and fulminate anathemas and excommunications against every Christian at the South, no matter what his conduct or character, simply because he will not submit to the arrogant beliefs of mortals who at best are, like himself, loaded with imperfections; and because he deems the Bible a safer directory than the dogmas of men, most of whom are every day proving themselves destitute of the sound mind and charity of the gospel—of people who are essentially monomaniacs—who cannot live without running into some insanity—who, if slavery were abolished, would be just as mad upon amalgamation, or manumission, or Milverton, or some other matter—and with whom, in fine, whatever your course may be as to the matter, you, nor any body in the North, who loves the Christian at the South, who loves the truth, and who loves the gospel better than self, and strife, and fanatical intolerance, will long be able to harmonize?

In the charity of the gospel, and with all respect,  
I am, &c., R. FULLER.  
Beaufort, S. C.

LETTER I.  
To the Rev. Richard Fuller, D. D.

MY DEAR BROTHER—

I have read with great interest your letter to Domestic Slavery in the Christian Reflector of the present week. Although addressed to the editor, yet as you have especially referred to sentiments which I have elsewhere advocated, I presume you will not consider it intrusive, if I ask the privilege of offering a few remarks in illustration of the doctrines from which you dissent. I fully believe that you, equally with myself, desire to arrive at the truth on this question. If by the kind and fraternal exhibition of our views we can throw

any light upon this difficult subject, we shall, I am sure, perform an acceptable service, both to the Church of Christ, and to our beloved country.

With many of the sentiments in your letter I heartily coincide. I unite with you and the late lamented Dr. Channing, in the opinion that the tone of the abolitionists at the north has been frequently, if not always, generally, "fierce, bitter, and abusive." The abolition press has, I believe, from the beginning, too commonly indulged in exaggerated statements, in violent denunciations, and in coarse and lacerating invective. At our late Missionary Convention in Philadelphia, I heard many things from men who claim to be the exclusive friends of the slave, which pained me more than I can express. It seemed to me that the spirit manifested was very different from the spirit of Christ. I also bear testimony to the general courtesy, the Christian urbanity, and the calmness under provocation, which, in the remarkable degree, characterized the conduct of the members from the South.

While, however, I say this, justice requires me to add that I seem to have perceived grave errors in the manner in which this subject has been treated in the slaveholding States. If, at the north, the right of free discussion has been abused, I think that frequently, at the south, this right has been denied to American citizens. I have seen legislative messages which have, in substance, asserted that the people of this country have no right to discuss the subject of slavery at all. I am sure you will agree with me in condemning every assumption of this kind. There is no subject whatever which I have not a perfect right to discuss, in the freest and fullest manner, in public and in private, provided I act with an honest intention to set before men what I consider to be important truth, and address myself to their understanding and conscience. I claim this right as a citizen of the United States; or rather, I claim it by a far higher title, as an intelligent creature of God. I can only surrender it with my life. I must always retain the threat of abridging it as an insult to the nature which has been given me by my Creator. If I abuse this right, I may be justly punished, and I grant that the punishment, both civil and social, should be exemplary. The right, however, as I have stated it, still remains interwoven with the essential elements of my intellectual and moral nature.

I rejoice that the question is assuming a new aspect. I rejoice that a brother from the south has invited this discussion, and that there is now an opportunity offered for freely exchanging our sentiments with each other. Should I abuse this right, should I utter a word that would tend needlessly to wound the feelings of my Southern brethren, there is not one of them that will be as deeply pained as myself. I have never yet visited the Southern States. There may be cases in which, from ignorance of the modes of thinking and forms of expression which prevail among my Southern fellow-citizens, I may, inadvertently, seem not sufficiently to regard their feelings. I do not anticipate that such a case will occur. But should it occur, I have only to ask that as an honest and kind man, desiring to hold forth what he believes to be truth; and that if I may seem in this respect to err, it may be imputed, not to an intention to give pain, but merely to my ignorance of the modes of thought peculiar to a state of society with which I am not familiar.

I would, in passing, offer another suggestion. The ground which is at present taken by the South, in regard to the whole question of slavery, seems to me to be of recent origin. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, I suppose it to have been very generally acknowledged throughout this whole country, that slavery was an evil, and a wrong, and that it was, tacitly at least, understood to be the duty of those States in which it existed, to remove it as soon as practicable. Pennsylvania had already commenced this work, and she moved on steadily by successive acts to its completion. New York very soon followed her example. There was at that time much less distinction than at present, between slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. It was, I think, generally acknowledged, and in which the whole country was in different degrees involved, and which the whole country was under a solemn moral obligation to remove.

The subject was every where freely discussed. I have before me at this moment, a speech delivered in the Convention held at Danville, Kentucky, by the Rev. David Rice, proving that "slavery is inconsistent with justice and good policy," printed in Philadelphia, 1792. It is so thorough, manly, and able a discussion of this whole subject, as within the same compass I have ever seen. This was delivered in the Convention for forming a constitution for that State, and I have no reason to suppose it gave any offence. This same freedom of discussion was enjoyed in Kentucky until the year 1820, when, on the 15th of January, a motion was entertained in the Legislature of that State to call a convention for the express purpose of abolishing slavery, and it failed of success only by the casting vote of the speaker. Nay, even as late as the year 1830, in the Convention for forming the present Constitution for Virginia, the whole subject was publicly discussed, with a freedom and an eloquence which even in that State, so fertile in orators, has never been excelled.

The presentation of memorials to Congress, on the subject of slavery, has of late been esteemed an intolerable grievance. Formerly it was not so considered. On the 8th day of December, 1791, memorials from Societies for the abolition of slavery, from the States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, were presented and read in the House of Representatives, and were referred to a select Committee. In the memorial from Connecticut it is stated, "that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature, impolitic in its principles, and in its consequences ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States."

The memorialists from Pennsylvania say, "we wish not to trespass on your time by referring to the different declarations made by Congress, on the undeniably right of all men to equal liberty; neither would we attempt in this place to point out the inconsistency of extending freedom to a part only of the human race." The memorialists from Baltimore declare "that the objects of their association are founded in justice and humanity; that in addition to an avowed enmity to slavery in every form, your memorialists in their exertions contemplate amelioration of the condition of that part of the

human race who are doomed to fill the degraded rank of slaves in our country." &c. The strongest expression of opinion, however, on this subject, occurs in the memorial from Virginia. It commences as follows: "Your memorialists, fully believing that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and that slavery is not only an 'odium degradation' but an outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the gospel, which breathes peace on earth and good-will to men, they lament that a practice so inconsistent with true policy, and the *unalienable rights of men*, should subsist in an enlightened age; and among a people professing that all mankind are by nature equally entitled to freedom." These noble sentiments, I repeat it, originated from Virginia, and were read and referred to a select Committee of the House of Representatives.

Much has also been said on the interference of Associations, and other ecclesiastical bodies, on this subject. I do not here enter upon the question whether or not such assemblies should, in their corporate capacity, take action on the matter of slavery. I will merely state that such action can claim very ancient precedents. At the meeting of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, held Aug. 7th, 1789, the following declaration was made: "Agreeably to a letter from the church at Baltimore, this Association declare their high approbation of the several societies formed in the United States and Europe, for the gradual abolition of the slavery of Africans, and for the guarding against their being detained or sent off to slavery at all. I am sure you will agree with me in condemning every assumption of this kind. There is no subject whatever which I have not a perfect right to discuss, in the freest and fullest manner, in public and in private, provided I act with an honest intention to set before men what I consider to be important truth, and address myself to their understanding and conscience. I claim this right as a citizen of the United States; or rather, I claim it by a far higher title, as an intelligent creature of God. I can only surrender it with my life. I must always retain the threat of abridging it as an insult to the nature which has been given me by my Creator. If I abuse this right, I may be justly punished, and I grant that the punishment, both civil and social, should be exemplary. The right, however, as I have stated it, still remains interwoven with the essential elements of my intellectual and moral nature.

I rejoice that the question is assuming a new aspect. I rejoice that a brother from the south has invited this discussion, and that there is now an opportunity offered for freely exchanging our sentiments with each other. Should I abuse this right, should I utter a word that would tend needlessly to wound the feelings of my Southern brethren, there is not one of them that will be as deeply pained as myself. I have never yet visited the Southern States. There may be cases in which, from ignorance of the modes of thinking and forms of expression which prevail among my Southern fellow-citizens, I may, inadvertently, seem not sufficiently to regard their feelings. I do not anticipate that such a case will occur. But should it occur, I have only to ask that as an honest and kind man, desiring to hold forth what he believes to be truth; and that if I may seem in this respect to err, it may be imputed, not to an intention to give pain, but merely to my ignorance of the modes of thought peculiar to a state of society with which I am not familiar.

I would, in passing, offer another suggestion. The ground which is at present taken by the South, in regard to the whole question of slavery, seems to me to be of recent origin. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, I suppose it to have been very generally acknowledged throughout this whole country, that slavery was an evil, and a wrong, and that it was, tacitly at least, understood to be the duty of those States in which it existed, to remove it as soon as practicable. Pennsylvania had already commenced this work, and she moved on steadily by successive acts to its completion. New York very soon followed her example. There was at that time much less distinction than at present, between slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. It was, I think, generally acknowledged, and in which the whole country was in different degrees involved, and which the whole country was under a solemn moral obligation to remove.

The subject was every where freely discussed. I have before me at this moment, a speech delivered in the Convention held at Danville, Kentucky, by the Rev. David Rice, proving that "slavery is inconsistent with justice and good policy," printed in Philadelphia, 1792. It is so thorough, manly, and able a discussion of this whole subject, as within the same compass I have ever seen. This was delivered in the Convention for forming a constitution for that State, and I have no reason to suppose it gave any offence. This same freedom of discussion was enjoyed in Kentucky until the year 1820, when, on the 15th of January, a motion was entertained in the Legislature of that State to call a convention for the express purpose of abolishing slavery, and it failed of success only by the casting vote of the speaker. Nay, even as late as the year 1830, in the Convention for forming the present Constitution for Virginia, the whole subject was publicly discussed, with a freedom and an eloquence which even in that State, so fertile in orators, has never been excelled.

The presentation of memorials to Congress, on the subject of slavery, has of late been esteemed an intolerable grievance. Formerly it was not so considered. On the 8th day of December, 1791, memorials from Societies for the abolition of slavery, from the States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, were presented and read in the House of Representatives, and were referred to a select Committee. In the memorial from Connecticut it is stated, "that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature, impolitic in its principles, and in its consequences ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States."

The memorialists from Pennsylvania say, "we wish not to trespass on your time by referring to the different declarations made by Congress, on the undeniably right of all men to equal liberty; neither would we attempt in this place to point out the inconsistency of extending freedom to a part only of the human race." The memorialists from Baltimore declare "that the objects of their association are founded in justice and humanity; that in addition to an avowed enmity to slavery in every form, your memorialists in their exertions contemplate amelioration of the condition of that part of the

human race who are doomed to fill the degraded rank of slaves in our country." &c. The strongest expression of opinion, however, on this subject, occurs in the memorial from Virginia. It commences as follows: "Your memorialists, fully believing that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and that slavery is not only an 'odium degradation' but an outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the gospel, which breathes peace on earth and good-will to men, they lament that a practice so inconsistent with true policy, and the *unalienable rights of men*, should subsist in an enlightened age; and among a people professing that all mankind are by nature equally entitled to freedom." These noble sentiments, I repeat it, originated from Virginia, and were read and referred to a select Committee of the House of Representatives.

Much has also been said on the interference of Associations, and other ecclesiastical bodies, on this subject. I do not here enter upon the question whether or not such assemblies should, in their corporate capacity, take action on the matter of slavery. I will merely state that such action can claim very ancient precedents. At the meeting of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, held Aug. 7th, 1789, the following declaration was made: "Agreeably to a letter from the church at Baltimore, this Association declare their high approbation of the several societies formed in the United States and Europe, for the gradual abolition of the slavery of Africans, and for the guarding against their being detained or sent off to slavery at all. I am sure you will agree with me in condemning every assumption of this kind. There is no subject whatever which I have not a perfect right to discuss, in the freest and fullest manner, in public and in private, provided I act with an honest intention to set before men what I consider to be important truth, and address myself to their understanding and conscience. I claim this right as a citizen of the United States; or rather, I claim it by a far higher title, as an intelligent creature of God. I can only surrender it with my life. I must always retain the threat of abridging it as an insult to the nature which has been given me by my Creator. If I abuse this right, I may be justly punished, and I grant that the punishment, both civil and social, should be exemplary. The right, however, as I have stated it, still remains interwoven with the essential elements of my intellectual and moral nature.

I rejoice that the question is assuming a new aspect. I rejoice that a brother from the south has invited this discussion, and that there is now an opportunity offered for freely exchanging our sentiments with each other. Should I abuse this right, should I utter a word that would tend needlessly to wound the feelings of my Southern brethren, there is not one of them that will be as deeply pained as myself. I have never yet visited the Southern States. There may be cases in which, from ignorance of the modes of thinking and forms of expression which prevail among my Southern fellow-citizens, I may, inadvertently, seem not sufficiently to regard their feelings. I do not anticipate that such a case will occur. But should it occur, I have only to ask that as an honest and kind man, desiring to hold forth what he believes to be truth; and that if I may seem in this respect to err, it may be imputed, not to an intention to give pain, but merely to my ignorance of the modes of thought peculiar to a state of society with which I am not familiar.

I would, in passing, offer another suggestion. The ground which is at present taken by the South, in regard to the whole question of slavery, seems to me to be of recent origin. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, I suppose it to have been very generally acknowledged throughout this whole country, that slavery was an evil, and a wrong, and that it was, tacitly at least, understood to be the duty of those States in which it existed, to remove it as soon as practicable. Pennsylvania had already commenced this work, and she moved on steadily by successive acts to its completion. New York very soon followed her example. There was at that time much less distinction than at present, between slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. It was, I think, generally acknowledged, and in which the whole country was in different degrees involved, and which the whole country was under a solemn moral obligation to remove.

The subject was every where freely discussed. I have before me at this moment, a speech delivered in the Convention held at Danville, Kentucky, by the Rev. David Rice, proving that "slavery is inconsistent with justice and good policy," printed in Philadelphia, 1792. It is so thorough, manly, and able a discussion of this whole subject, as within the same compass I have ever seen. This was delivered in the Convention for forming a constitution for that State, and I have no reason to suppose it gave any offence. This same freedom of discussion was enjoyed in Kentucky until the year 1820, when, on the 15th of January, a motion was entertained in the Legislature of that State to call a convention for the express purpose of abolishing slavery, and it failed of success only by the casting vote of the speaker. Nay, even as late as the year 1830, in the Convention for forming the present Constitution for Virginia, the whole subject was publicly discussed, with a freedom and an eloquence which even in that State, so fertile in orators, has never been excelled.

The presentation of memorials to Congress, on the subject of slavery, has of late been esteemed an intolerable grievance. Formerly it was not so considered. On the 8th day of December, 1791, memorials from Societies for the abolition of slavery, from the States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, were presented and read in the House of Representatives, and were referred to a select Committee. In the memorial from Connecticut it is stated, "that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature, impolitic in its principles, and in its consequences ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States."

The memorialists from Pennsylvania say, "we wish not to trespass on your time by referring to the different declarations made by Congress, on the undeniably right of all men to equal liberty; neither would we attempt in this place to point out the inconsistency of extending freedom to a part only of the human race." The memorialists from Baltimore declare "that the objects of their association are founded in justice and humanity; that in addition to an avowed enmity to slavery in every form, your memorialists in their exertions contemplate amelioration of the condition of that part of the

human race who are doomed to fill the degraded rank of slaves in our country." &c. The strongest expression of opinion, however, on this subject, occurs in the memorial from Virginia. It commences as follows: "Your memorialists, fully believing that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and that slavery is not only an 'odium degradation' but an outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the gospel, which breathes peace on earth and good-will to men, they lament that a practice so inconsistent with true policy, and the *unalienable rights of men*, should subsist in an enlightened age; and among a people professing that all mankind are by nature equally entitled to freedom." These noble sentiments, I repeat it, originated from Virginia, and were read and referred to a select Committee of the House of Representatives.

Much has also been said on the interference of Associations, and other ecclesiastical bodies, on this subject. I do not here enter upon the question whether or not such assemblies should, in their corporate capacity, take action on the matter of slavery. I will merely state that such action can claim very ancient precedents. At the meeting of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, held Aug. 7th, 1789, the following declaration was made: "Agreeably to a letter from the church at Baltimore, this Association declare their high approbation of the several societies formed in the United States and Europe, for the gradual abolition of the slavery of Africans, and for the guarding against their being detained or sent off to slavery at all. I am sure you will agree with me in condemning every assumption of this kind. There is no subject whatever which I have not a perfect right to discuss, in the freest and fullest manner, in public and in private, provided I act with an honest intention to set before men what I consider to be important truth, and address myself to their understanding and conscience. I claim this right as a citizen of the United States; or rather, I claim it by a far higher title, as an intelligent creature of God. I can only surrender it with my life. I must always retain the threat of abridging it as an insult to the nature which has been given me by my Creator. If I abuse this right, I may be justly punished, and I grant that the punishment, both civil and social, should be exemplary. The right, however, as I have stated it, still remains interwoven with the essential elements of my intellectual and moral nature.

I rejoice that the question is assuming a new aspect. I rejoice that a brother from the south has invited this discussion, and that there is now an opportunity offered for freely exchanging our sentiments with each other. Should I abuse this right, should I utter a word that would tend needlessly to wound the feelings of my Southern brethren, there is not one of them that will be as deeply pained as myself. I have never yet visited the Southern States. There may be cases in which, from ignorance of the modes of thinking and forms of expression which prevail among my Southern fellow-citizens, I may, inadvertently, seem not sufficiently to regard their feelings. I do not anticipate that such a case will occur. But should it occur, I have only to ask that as an honest and kind man, desiring to hold forth what he believes to be truth; and that if I may seem in this respect to err, it may be imputed, not to an intention to give pain, but merely to my ignorance of the modes of thought peculiar to a state of society with which I am not familiar.

I would, in passing, offer another suggestion. The ground which is at present taken by the South, in regard to the whole question of slavery, seems to me to be of recent origin. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, I suppose it to have been very generally acknowledged throughout this whole country, that slavery was an evil, and a wrong, and that it was, tacitly at least, understood to be the duty of those States in which it existed, to remove it as soon as practicable. Pennsylvania had already commenced this work, and she moved on steadily by successive acts to its completion. New York very soon followed her example. There was at that time much less distinction than at present, between slaveholding and non-slaveholding States. It was, I think, generally acknowledged, and in which the whole country was in different degrees involved, and which the whole country was under a solemn moral obligation to remove.

The subject was every where freely discussed. I have before me at this moment, a speech delivered in the Convention held at Danville, Kentucky, by the Rev. David Rice, proving that "slavery is inconsistent with justice and good policy," printed in Philadelphia, 1792. It is so thorough, manly, and able a discussion of this whole subject, as within the same compass I have ever seen. This was delivered in the Convention for forming a constitution for that State, and I have no reason to suppose it gave any offence. This same freedom of discussion was enjoyed in Kentucky until the year 1820, when, on the 15th of January, a motion was entertained in the Legislature of that State to call a convention for the express purpose of abolishing slavery, and it failed of success only by the casting vote of the speaker. Nay, even as late as the year 1830, in the Convention for forming the present Constitution for Virginia, the whole subject was publicly discussed, with a freedom and an eloquence which even in that State, so fertile in orators, has never been excelled.

The presentation of memorials to Congress, on the subject of slavery, has of late been esteemed an intolerable grievance. Formerly it was not so considered. On the 8th day of December, 1791, memorials from Societies for the abolition of slavery, from the States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, were presented and read in the House of Representatives, and were referred to a select Committee. In the memorial from Connecticut it is stated, "that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature, impolitic in its principles, and in its consequences ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States."

The memorialists from Pennsylvania say, "we wish not to trespass on your time by referring to the different declarations made by Congress, on the undeniably right of all men to equal liberty; neither would we attempt in this place to point out the inconsistency of extending freedom to a part only of the human race." The memorialists from Baltimore declare "that the objects of their association are founded in justice and humanity; that in addition to an avowed enmity to slavery in every form, your memorialists in their exertions contemplate amelioration of the condition of that part of the

human race who are doomed to fill the degraded rank of slaves in our country." &c. The strongest expression of opinion, however, on this subject, occurs in the memorial from Virginia. It commences as follows: "Your memorialists, fully believing that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and that slavery is not only an 'odium degradation' but an outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the







# THE TRUE AMERICAN.

"GOD AND LIBERTY."

LEXINGTON, TUESDAY, AUG. 3.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—We take this method to notify new subscribers that it is not in our power to furnish back numbers; although we increase our number of copies every week, we cannot keep pace with the demand which is so much beyond our probable estimate.

In answer to the numerous complaints, that our paper is received very irregularly, we can only say our mailing clerk is very particular in making up packages, and the fault must be at the office of delivery.

It is always painful and often seems ungenerous to make reflections (however just they may be) bearing on a community, for as in the individual case a man loves his flatterer better than his friend, so men collectively prefer their sycophants to their counsellors. But this consideration, which at best is but a selfish one, should never deter the champion of truth from uttering aloud the sentiments, trusting to the common sense of mankind at last to recognize his motive and to the future to realize his views, so thinking; and as one loving his native State and fully appreciating her natural advantages from her human to her animal race, from her climate to her soil, from her capability to her productions, I cannot hesitate to draw a comparison unfavorable to her present aspect between the condition of her sister and junior States Indiana, Ohio and Illinois, and her own in point of labor, manufactures and commerce. The appeals to humanity and justice have been over done with regard to slavery and can never be efficacious so long as interest and avarice stand in the way; could the community once be convinced that their own welfare was more at stake than that of the negro, great results might be obtained from the illustration of truth and expediency. It is only on this ground that any man should seek to sink the fabric of slavery. Let us resolutely fix our eyes on the immediate results which Emancipation must and will exert upon our institutions—let us have the nerve and manly wisdom not only to observe but acknowledge the result of these observations, and make use of them as data. We behold in these sister States which I would fain hold up as an example, and contrast to our own populous cities, pouring out manufactured goods almost equal in amount to those produced in the older States, and not inferior in quality. Where do the merchants of this consuming State go for their manufactures? Do they any longer take long and expensive journeys to the East? No.—Cincinnati furnishes all we require either in the ornamental or useful line, her commerce affords us a near and good market for the few articles we grow for exportation, and while she by her commerce and manufactures is making giant strides to greatness, wealth and population under her free institutions, we are content to stand still tending our herds in ignoble indolence like the pastoral people of old, instead of increasing in the knowledge of the sciences and the practice of the arts. The annexed extract from a new work on political economy will ably express our sentiments and opinions on this subject.

"Slavery, as it now exists in the United States, is calculated to exert a great influence upon our policy and future prosperity. I am not going to discuss the horrors of slavery or its moral turpitude, on all these points there can be but one opinion. I merely take it as it exists, as it stands marked and fastened upon us, and intend to show the bearing it has upon our markets, labor and productions. The staples produced in this country by slaves, say cotton, sugar, rice, tobacco and hemp, that would have had no existence without them, for the last fifty years, have averaged fifty millions of dollars a year, which in the fifty years amounts to the enormous sum of twenty-five hundred millions of dollars. This sum has realized, and constituted mainly the whole of our ability with which to purchase supplies abroad. Foreign nations, England more than all the others, have got, enjoyed and realized, in the shape of capital, this twenty-five hundred millions of dollars, and we have consumed it, and not a vestige of it left behind. Had we not possessed this resource, we would have been infinitely better off; and, instead of three millions of slaves being fastened upon us, we would have had free people in their place, not growing these staples, but supporting themselves and adding real wealth to the country, instead of a mere capacity to consume, and thereby enrich foreigners. But for this ability arising from slave labor, enabling us to buy so much abroad, we would have been forced by the necessity of the case, to supply ourselves, and thus not only have established manufactures, but developed the real resources and independence of the country. We would have been by this time so far advanced in skill and capital that with our intelligence, industry and enterprise, aided by an active commerce giving full and efficient effect to them, we might and would have been a wealthy nation and been now supplying much of the world with articles of our industry, skill and taste. This people never would have remained inefficient had they not been flattered and lulled by the proceeds of this slave labor. It employed our shipping and commerce so much that by the aid of our merchants, the slaveholders have governed the country and kept back every other great interest. The country is now, or will be, in a situation like an amputated limb, depending literally on the amputation, funds, by some revolution, that suddenly stopped. When slavery shall have run itself out, or yielded to the changes and amelioration of the times, the owners and dependants upon it will stand appalled and prostrate, as the sot from whom liquor has been withheld, and nothing but the bad and worthless habit left to remind the country of its ruinous effects.

We call the attention of our agricultural readers to the advertisement in this number of Messrs. Thornton & Grinstead—

is informed that necessity is better adapted to the cultivation of mustard than ours, and certainly there is no production which yields a better reward to the industry of the farmer with a near and constant market;—farmers look to it—let us meet our home demand.

We point the attention of our readers to the easy and graceful style of the letter from New York, which has a place in our columns today.

It has all the character of polished conversation, combined with the aristocratic arrangement of one who considers the "grey goose quill" a tried and agreeable companion.

We are promised more of these pleasant letters in the course of events, and shall endeavor to merit the favors we receive from their fair author, by the gallantry of our behaviour and the loyalty of our principles.

The favor of our correspondents has accumulated so rapidly upon us, that we have determined to devote this number almost exclusively to their service, that we may be able to give in our next more editorial matter.

John F. Wall, member elect of the Virginia legislature, from Frederick county, was nearly killed a few days since, while travelling in a railroad car, by what is called a snakehead. He was severely but not dangerously injured.—*Louisville Courier.*

Was he "nearly killed" friend Bryant, and still "not dangerously injured"?

CHESS—SOLUTION TO PROBLEM No. 7.

White.	Black.
1. K to Q 3	1. K to R sq.
2. K to Q 7	2. K to Kt sq.
3. K to R 7	3. K to R sq.
4. R to KR 7 ch.	4. K to Kt sq.
5. P 1 ch. mate.	

TO THE VOTERS OF LOUISVILLE.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—I take this time to define more explicitly my political views, while I present myself a candidate for a place in the next General Assembly of our Commonwealth. Hitherto, the people of Kentucky have been deterred from the discussion of the subject of a State Convention for the reformation of our Constitution and fundamental laws, by the universal outcry against the abolition of slavery. No sooner a friend of human liberty and the prosperity of his State sounds the tocsin of reform from the citadel of his country's safety, than a thousand daggers are eager to leap from their scabbards to silence the innovator forever. Men have argued as though there was no method by which a State could fling off the shackles, save that of immediate and unconditional Abolition. And then Abolition and a host of terrors are portrayed by the man of avarice and by the ephemeral demagogue to startle freemen from redressing the evils of Slavery—and not these only, but the manifold evils and oppressions under which this Commonwealth has groined since the period of the foundation of its government. But the day has passed by—and men will no longer confound the doctrines of the Abolitionist with the salutary counsels of the Emancipationist. The Abolitionist teaches the immediate and unconditional annihilation of Slavery, regardless of the rights of the owner and the consequences to the community in which it may exist. Emancipation may be devised in various ways. To the one I am opposed. I am in favor of the other in every form that can be possibly redound to the general good. The first is an invasion of the rights of the owner—the last is of choice, and proceeds from the hand of the owner in the exercise of his private or public privileges. The one denies the owner's right to his slaves—the other acknowledges his right, and would not divest him without a consideration. Of the many forms of Emancipation, the following appears to me to be the simplest, the most practicable, the safest. Let the people of Kentucky, in the exercise of their original and inherent rights, change the primary law of the land. Let them proceed after the manner prescribed by our present Constitution to frame a new one. The new Constitution will develop a feature which shall limit the term of service of all slaves born after its adoption to a period not exceeding twenty-one years. This feature will make it obligatory upon those for whom this service is rendered to impart to these apprentices the rudiments of an English education. At the expiration of this apprenticeship, let them fall into the hands of County Commissioners, who shall hire them to masters until their wages shall amount to a sum sufficient to bear them to the coast of Africa. Subsequent statutory provisions might be enacted by the Legislature to guard these provisions at every imaginable point. How simple! How practicable! How safe! Yet, if this simple scheme were adopted, Slavery, after the lapse of a few years, would cease to blight the prosperity and blacken the escutcheon of Kentucky. And to whose injury would it redound? To the injury of the owner? No. To the injury of the slave? Not a whit. The philanthropic owner will be indemnified by the increase value of his real estate and the sale of his slave. The slave of the philanthropic owner goes to the live home, where climate, soil, country and privilege are congenial to his health, happiness and honor. And as chains are the only heritage of the slave of the pro-slavery man, he may as well enjoy them in one State of this Union as another. The term of his servitude may as well be protracted in the wilds of Texas as upon the soil of Kentucky.

But who will be benefited by the operation of this scheme? All men of all classes and conditions, from the independent Agriculturist down through all the departments of business to the humble Attorney, who now addresses you. In the State of Kentucky there are about two hundred thousand slaves. Remove them, a vacuum is created that must be filled. Remove them, and instantly from all points of the compass industrious and enterprising white men will rush in to double, triple and quadruple our present population. Instead of a half a million of inhabitants, the garden of America will burst forth two millions. What a wonderful impulse will be given to every variety of business! What an endless variety of interests will be created by the prodigious influx of population! Commerce will spring up everywhere. The soil will be restored to his proper position in an equalized community. The day-laborer no longer competes with the slave. The man who works for daily wages no longer com-

petes with a slave who works for no wages at all. But instantly the honest and virtuous poor man enjoys an equal chance to be equal in all respects with the most wealthy and intelligent. All men, then, will be benefited, and no man injured. Africa too will rejoice when she beholds the germs of civilization bursting into brightness and beauty through the instrumentality of American Colonization. Light and knowledge will ride the wings of acquisition and conquest until a whole Continent shall have emerged from the depths of barbarism and arisen to the triumphant estate of intellectual liberty. And why not consummate a scheme so replete with every thing teeming with prosperity and wonderful in goodness! Happily for our country the consummation is ready at hand. In our State there are one hundred and twenty thousand voters. Of these but twenty-five thousand are slaveholders. And of these many are Anti-Slavery men. But who shall rule? Is it consonant with our Republican institutions, or flattering to the vanity of the few, that so small a minority should dictate to so overwhelming a majority? Let the people of Kentucky arise in the majesty of their strength—shake off their shackles, and the last nail will be driven into the coffin of slavery, and the monster, with all its horrors and all its horns, will be buried beneath the soil of the free land of the brave.

Other portions of our Constitution call loudly for reform. Judges are appointed for life; clerks of courts for life; justices of the peace for life. Impediments for malfeasance in office are seldom heard of—for nonfeasance, never. A few Circuit Judges have been impeached for malfeasance in office, but no single instance of impeachment has been sustained. Are these things neglected and defeated because all gentlemen are active and efficient in their performance of the duties of their offices, and unsuited to their fidelity to the appointing power? Assuredly not. Many and loud are the clamors that arise because of the oppressions that spring from their irresponsibility. These omissions, and these failures, are the natural results of defects in the Constitution. If the primary law of the land would but circumscribe the tenure of office, an incalculable multiplicity of evils would be prevented. Then these gentlemen would remember that they must give an account of their stewardship, and this demand of accountability would operate as a most wholesome corrective of the most stuporous abuses.

As for the County Bench, composed as it is of magistrates who elect themselves, out of which grows the sheriffalty, which creates its own executive officers, and is responsible to nothing but itself—down with it. It is anti-republican, it is a relic of mischief, and but one breath only of popular indignation is necessary to prostrate it, root, stem, and branch.

Long has the country endured these evils, but the day of her redemption is drawing nigh. The voice of the people will go up in a shout, and nothing will stand in the way of their redressing the wrongs of the past. The institutions save their traces upon the dusty tomes that contain the defect jurisprudence of nations.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The question of a State Convention is above partisan rancor, or partisan opposition. Neither of the political parties can carry it. If one party, in its own strength, take it up, it will fall to the ground. It behooves the friends of reform to hold it aloof from party. Let it "live or die, sink or swim, survive or perish," upon its own merits. It is before the people. No suspicious time for its canvass, save the present, has hovered over the country for the last twenty years. Now is the fulcrum of time. This is emphatically its proper time.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—I am a candidate for your suffrages. Let Louisville speak her wishes at the polls on the first Monday in August. And should I be one of her honored instruments, I shall use my humble abilities to usher in the day when the people of Kentucky shall triumph over their oppressors, and her banner shall wave the banner of the free.

ROBERT F. BAIRD.

July 19, 1845.

From the New York Tribune.

REV. WM. H. CHANNING yesterday continued his discourse on the Duties of the Freemen of the North in respect to Slavery and the Slave Power. He began by recapitulating the chief points in the Texas question which were three: 1st. Annexation by the will of Texas and with the tacit consent of Mexico. This can never be a peaceful process. The acquisition of Texas would lead to the possession of California, which would produce an endless series of border wars with the Mexicans and Indians, and must result in a war of conquest on the part of the United States and the ultimate seizure of the whole continent down to the Isthmus of Panama. 2nd. Mexico, conquering her weakness, her poverty and her despair, might resolve to die upon her frontier, and whatever it may be, would do her what she could to resist our progress. 3d. Texas might perhaps accept the independence offered by Mexico—but even this would, in all probability, end in war. The Slave power were determined on Annexation, and they would have Texas, with or without the Union. This, therefore, must lead to war and the ruin of Mexico. To what end was all this done? To uphold Slavery, to increase the value of Slave property, and to prevent the escape of Slaves from bondage—while a further reason was the desire to oppose Great Britain in her efforts to abolish Slavery. In short, in any way it could be viewed, the United States were called upon to enter upon an aggressive warfare for the one purpose of upholding Slavery.—This was done by the necessarily increasing aggressions of the Slave power and by the mercenary commercial spirit of the North.

The speaker then proceeded to inquire into the original design and destiny of the United States—designated that they were the chosen people of the Lord, the favored instruments to establish and carry out the principles of universal liberty—the leader of the hosts of freedom.—America was colonized by Spain, France and England, but it was the peculiarity of the English colonies that they were made at a time when every heart engaged in them burned with the love of liberty. The very soil of this people was the Gospel of Christianity, the law of love—their mind the common law asserting and maintaining the rights of humanity. But elsewhere but a tendency, was in England already a fulfillment—the colonists from England gathered, as it were, the first fruits of the seeds of liberty—they came here to make this land an Eden, a Paradise of brethren, our King, God over all. This was Israel—the chosen people of God.—It was no accident but instinct with life and love were at length born into life by being separated from our mother country. The first cry of the infant nation was the Declaration of Independence—that assertion of the law of brotherhood and justice which is the life of this nation.

How have we forgotten this—how have we lost our faith? God gave us, at first, national innocence; then there was in our life and dignity; then the wisdom of our fathers, and still that sleepless rock will be watching, and watching the works of our eyes, busy race, with the same sad, earnest eyes, and the same tranquil mien, everlasting.

You dare not mock at the Sphinx.

THE PRINTING TELEGRAPH.—The New York Commercial says: "Our readers were informed, the other day, that we had seen the work of this new instrument—a slip of paper, having on its surface some words printed by the telegraph. We have since had an opportunity of seeing the machine itself, and we can say that it is a most ingenious and wonderful thing. It is, in fact, a small, portable, and so far as we can judge, perfectly efficient. We are re-

strained from telling how its operations are performed, or giving any intimation of its construction; but of its doings we may speak, and surely there is nothing we can say that would go beyond its merits. Its advantages over Morse's telegraph are, greater rapidity of action, greater certainty, and facility of use by any person. For Morse's telegraph, there must be a person at each end capable of translating the hieroglyphic marks and dots; but the printing telegraph makes the ordinary letters, arranged them in words, and can be governed by any person who can spell. We shall say no more at present, understanding that no very long time will elapse before the printing telegraph will be open for every body's inspection."

THAT WORD AGAIN.

How far one word of kindness will go! If we could only measure the effect of a generous look—of one considerate and sympathizing expression, we would cultivate gentleness of manner—a real generosity of heart, as among the highest means of good we possess.

Walking on Sabbath afternoon, some weeks ago in an obscure part of the town, we met an acquaintance, coming out of a humble dwelling. He looked depressed.

"What ails you?" we asked. "Oh, nothing," was the reply, "only there is a poor fellow in that room, far away from his home, who I fear will never live to see it again. Just go in and look at him."

We did as bid. In a narrow room, on a comfortable bed, there lay the sick man, reduced to the very last extremity. He was of large frame, and had a manly, intelligent countenance. At first, he seemed disturbed; but when we told him, his friend who had just left, bade us come in, he gave us his hand, and the tears rolled freely down his cheeks. "I believe that man," said he, "has saved my life. I have been sick these many days. I have had physic and all that was absolutely necessary for me. But I have not had, during all this long time, one home look—one word of that kind of affection which goes right to the heart and makes a man wish to live, or ready to die, unless he came; he brought me this orange which seems the most delicious thing I ever tasted; he wept with me when I wept; and now, though my fever is raging high, I feel as if I must recover."

We comforted and encouraged as well as we could the sick man, and then left.

At night we returned again to the sick chamber. There we found our friend—rough as before in exterior—sun-burnt with hard outdoor work—a common day laborer, in short, but with a noble feeling as polished as high and noble feeling. He was watching his fellow, tending the stranger, and slaking his parched thirst with the juice of the orange.

It was a beautiful sight. The hearts of the two were one—their very looks told it. Our voice was choked as we gazed on the scene, and we could not speak. Soon after the physician entered; he examined his patient, and quickly said, "Why you are better—your pulse is more regular, and, though the fever has not quite gone, every symptom is favorable. I had given you up. When did you perceive the change?" "When that brother came and spoke to me as a brother, Oh! I was lonely at heart; sicker than in the body; he relieved me here, (pressing his bosom), and since then I have breathed freer, and I felt better," "Thank God!" murmured the physician. "What will not kindness do! It is greater than medicine; it heals when all else fails."

We called daily in the room of the stranger, and daily saw him mending. Very soon after, indeed, he was able to walk out. And as soon as he was thus able, he came to us, and repeated to us (how touchingly we cannot express,) what he told us in the sick chamber, that nothing but the kindness of his friend had saved him. "I have come to you," he said, "I have been to the order of the Sons of Temperance; this was our only first bond of union; but that was enough; as any thing would be enough which would draw the well to the bedside of the suffering sick, in sympathy and affection. I go a happy man to rest in peace once more in the bosom of an humble but happy home."

And truly did the stranger speak. A cup of cold water given in a right spirit—a sympathizing look at the right time—a friendly cheer when the heart is bowed down, and life ebbing fast, will re-animate the body and the soul, restore the sorrowing to contentment; the suffering to happiness, and the sick to health. Who, then, does not feel like cultivating this exceeding great virtue of benevolence for his own sake? The man who does so, and follows the example of the humble Son of Temperance to whom we have alluded, will be rich in every good and great quality of soul, be his purse light or heavy.

ST. LOUIS MANUFACTURERS.—We have another and a new article to chronicle in the way of St. Louis manufactures. Barron and Rothwell, Druggists, on Vine street, between Main street and the landing, are manufacturing every description of "fire-works," and are selling them wholesale at eastern prices. We believe this is the first instance in which we have come in direct competition with the east, in the manufacture of this article, consequently we shall be able on the coming fourth of July, to manifest our patriotism by the burning of our own fire-works.—*St. Louis Recreiter.*

OREGON EMIGRANTS.—The Ohio Statesman has letters from an Oregon emigrant to his brother in Ohio, written on the 13th and 20th of May—the latter one hundred and sixty miles west of the Missouri State line. They appear to find good roads, to travel slowly, being bothered by their loose cattle and the incessant attempts of the Kaw and Kausas Indians to steal them. They met, on the 20th, some men coming from the mountains, who reported that road, for one hundred miles ahead lined with emigrants to Oregon.

A new Pin Making Machine has been contrived at Brattleboro, Vt., which works like an intelligent being, and is thus described by a traveller:—"About the wire, I circled the head, then took the pin in my fingers and sharpened the point on several grindstones, and finally threw it finished into the receptacle beneath. And all this was apparently without the intervention of any human agency. I believe all the 'tending requisite was to supply the wire. After being whitened, the pins were poured into another machine, and there they stuck themselves into paper with wonderful regularity."

JESUITS IN INDIA.—The London Morning Herald says:—"The activity of the Jesuits in almost every part of India is great, their energy is unflagging, and their influence is rapidly extending throughout the country. Their rise has been extraordinary rapid; and as there are among them men of high ability and good character, it is impossible for a member of the Protestant community to look on with indifference. Their religious views are engaged in controversy, to an extent unsuspected by few, often disguised, always subtle, and in every position most dangerous."

At the close of the Polk in this city, on Monday evening, the vote stood as follows:

FOR CONGRESS.	FOR SENATE.
Garrett Davis, 799	Thos. F. Marshall, 520
Robt. S. Todd, 677	C. C. Moore, 508

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

Leahie Combs, 829	J. Cunningham, 475
G. W. Dunsby, 574	Elihu Huggan, 384

From the Boston Journal.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR:—It cannot be doubted that the question which is likely to bring about a dissolution of the Union is the existing one of the continuance of slavery by a portion of the nation against the wish of the remainder. The politics of the country have hinged upon it for years; and the jealousy of rival sections of the influence of either in the national councils is growing more intense with every succeeding national election, until the strife is likely to result in the destruction of our unity and nationality; and there is little question that in the contest of the friends of the Constitution, we are likely to be victorious, for the present at least. Therefore, seeing the South and her peculiar interests and ideas will prevail, the North should be willing to make a great sacrifice to preserve her just influence and rights; for the sake of a reconciliation and common fame; remembering that upon the same pillar of glory are inscribed the names of Marion and Warren, Gates and Laurens, Stark and Sumpter, and a host of true-hearted soldiers who in the dark days of the Revolution fought for a common country.

The object of this communication is to propose a method of effecting this much desired consummation, viz., by appropriating the public lands, or the proceeds of the sale, to the payment to their owners of the full value of all the slaves in the country, under such regulations as will secure the entire extinction of slavery.

The North in thus proposing the gift of her patrimony to the South, for the sake of peace, will most fully show that she can make a sacrifice for the general good, and that selfishness is not her sole motive in seeking the abolition of slavery; and if the South has in any degree that spirit of generosity, for which she has such an extensive reputation, she will meet the offer with a cordiality worthy of herself. If any say that slavery is wrong, and that we should not be called upon to purchase the consent of men to do what is right; we answer it is impossible that such can be friends of their country, or of the slave. Is not the object to be effected worthy of the price? and will not be gained years before any other mode, short of civil war or insurrection, will effect it? or centuries before the bodies called "Abolition meetings" will infuse into the South a love for the negro race? We ask the attention of thinking men to this plan, and if a better can be offered let it be done; but we may be sure that the people of the South will never give up their slaves without remuneration, and from what other source this can come, we are at a loss to conceive.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RIGHT.—In a speech lately delivered in Boston, Deacon Moses Grant said, "It is an appalling fact that with all our Sabbath and day schools, crime among the young is on the increase, as the records of our courts and prisons will satisfy the most credulous; and why is it? the truth must be spoken; humanity and religion demand it. I answer, then, because so many men of wealth withhold, by their example and influence, proper sympathy in the temperance reform, my nurse, even make money in a way injurious to society, and not only continue in a traffic known to be wrong, but rent buildings used for gambling and dissipation. On the rich then rests the fearful responsibility of such a state of things, and to them I appeal for a remedy! They may give liberally, and certainly no city does more in the way of charity (than ours) yet that will avail but little to stem the current of vice. We want something better than money—their example and influence, openly, on the side of suffering humanity—then we may hope our city will continue to be what it has been, remarkable for its proper observance of the Sabbath and respect to the institutions of our fathers, on which so much depends."

THE NEW LAW.—Under the new Post Office Law, the Postmasters are required to give the letter list to the paper having the largest circulation in the district supplied by their offices. The Philadelphia Ledger has the following on the subject.

From the Philadelphia Ledger.

More than one good effect will result incidentally from the section of the new post office law requiring the list of letters to be published in the newspapers having the largest circulation. It will save the paper advertisers from that very common source of imposition, the claim to the most extensive circulation by a rival paper, which is perpetuated by the circulation of those who have any circulation worth speaking of, can very easily prove it under the new law. The process is simple.

WE "PAY FOR HEATING THE POKER."—Ready and anxious as our government has been to pay any and every claim that Texas preferred, there were, it seems, a few items overlooked during the Washington negotiation. These were recently brought to the consideration of our Chargé, Mr. Nelson, by President Jones. Among these were the delegates and the expenses of the convention, which was elected and met to ratify the treaty of annexation. Mr. Jones of course assures President Jones that this will be attended to at Washington; that we are so anxious to marry Texas that we not only take her dowry, but in debt, and pay the bridal expenses. All this might be endured if we were marrying into a decent family.—if our betrothed were either beautiful, accomplished, virtuous, or half-white. To drop the metaphor, we take Texas with her war slavery, debt, &c., and then pay her travelling expenses, board, tavern, and hotel bills. If there be any other forgotten items—say charge for washing, "mending pantaloons," &c., bring them on. Among the national treasury is open to any and all demands made as the price of Texas Annexation.—*Albany Evening Journal.*

A CHINESEMAN'S IMPRESSION OF AMERICA.—We find the following in a late number of the N. Y. Evening Post:—"I am one of the numerous specimens of the natural and artificial productions of the Celestial empire which Mr. Peters has brought with him on his return to the United States, are two intelligent and educated subjects of the 'Brother of the Moon.' One of these Chinese gentlemen is striding to be preparing a journal of his travels in this country, the publication of which will be looked for with interest. It will certainly be one of the most remarkable curiosities of literature which these latter times have produced. In the meantime, these Celestial visitors are making no little sensation, as well among the fashionable society of our wondrous-loving city, as among the little vagabond throngs of our streets, who make it a point to follow them in crowds whenever they appear out of doors."

At the close of the Polk in this city, on Monday evening, the vote stood as follows:

FOR CONGRESS.	FOR SENATE.
Garrett Davis, 799	Thos. F. Marshall, 520
Robt. S. Todd, 677	C. C. Moore, 508

FOR REPRESENTATIVES.

Leahie Combs, 829	J. Cunningham, 475
G. W. Dunsby, 574	Elihu Huggan, 384

From the Boston Journal.

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR:—It cannot be doubted that the question which is likely to bring about a dissolution of the Union is the existing one of the continuance of slavery by a portion of the nation against the wish of the remainder. The politics of the country have hinged upon it for years; and the jealousy of rival sections of the influence of either in the national councils is growing more intense with every succeeding national election, until the strife is likely to result in the destruction of our unity and nationality; and there is little question that in the contest of the friends of the Constitution, we are likely to be victorious, for the present at least. Therefore, seeing the South and her peculiar interests and ideas will prevail, the North should be willing to make a great sacrifice to preserve her just influence and rights; for the sake of a reconciliation and common fame; remembering that upon the same pillar of glory are inscribed the names of Marion and Warren, Gates and Laurens, Stark and Sumpter, and a host of true-hearted soldiers who in the dark days of the Revolution fought for a common country.

The object of this communication is to propose a method of effecting this much desired consummation, viz., by appropriating the public lands, or the proceeds of the sale, to the payment to their owners of the full value of all the slaves in the country, under such regulations as will secure the entire extinction of slavery.

The North in thus proposing the gift of her patrimony to the South, for the sake of peace, will most fully show that she can make a sacrifice for the general good, and that selfishness is not her sole motive in seeking the abolition of slavery; and if the South has in any degree that spirit of generosity, for which she has such an extensive reputation, she will meet the offer with a cordiality worthy of herself. If any say that slavery is wrong, and that we should not be called upon to purchase the consent of men to do what is right; we answer it is impossible that such can be friends of their country, or of the slave. Is not the object to be effected worthy of the price? and will not be gained years before any other mode, short of civil war or insurrection, will effect it? or centuries before the bodies called "Abolition meetings" will infuse into the South a love for the negro race? We ask the attention of thinking men to this plan, and if a better can be offered let it be done; but we may be sure that the people of the South will never give up their slaves without remuneration, and from what other source this can come, we are at a loss to conceive.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE RIGHT.—In a speech lately delivered in Boston, Deacon Moses Grant said, "It is an appalling fact that with all our Sabbath and day schools, crime among the young is on the increase, as the records of our courts and prisons will satisfy the most credulous; and why is it? the truth must be spoken; humanity and religion demand it. I answer, then, because so many men of wealth withhold, by their example and influence, proper sympathy in the temperance reform, my nurse, even make money in a way injurious to society, and not only continue in a traffic known to be wrong, but rent buildings used for gambling and dissipation. On the rich then rests the fearful responsibility of such a state of things, and to them I appeal for a remedy! They may give liberally, and certainly no city does more in the way of charity (than ours) yet that will avail but little to stem the current of vice. We want something better than money—their example and influence, openly, on the side of suffering humanity—then we may hope our city will continue to be what it has been, remarkable for its proper observance of the Sabbath and respect to the institutions of our fathers, on which so much depends."

THE NEW LAW.—Under the new Post Office Law, the Postmasters are required to give the letter list to the paper having the largest circulation in the district supplied by their offices. The Philadelphia Ledger has the following on the subject.

From the Philadelphia Ledger.

More than one good effect will result incidentally from the section of the new post office law requiring the list of letters to be published in the newspapers having the largest circulation. It will save the paper advertisers from that very common source of imposition, the claim to the most extensive circulation by a rival paper, which is perpetuated by the circulation of those who have any circulation worth speaking of, can very easily prove it under the new law. The process is simple.

WE "PAY FOR HEATING THE POKER."—Ready and anxious as our government has been to pay any and every claim that Texas preferred, there were, it seems, a few items overlooked during the Washington negotiation. These were recently brought to the consideration of our Chargé, Mr. Nelson, by President Jones. Among these were the delegates and the expenses of the convention, which was elected and met to ratify the treaty of annexation. Mr. Jones of course assures President Jones that this will be attended to at Washington; that we are so anxious to marry Texas that we not only take her dowry, but in debt, and pay the bridal expenses. All this might be endured if we were marrying into a decent family.—if our betrothed were either beautiful, accomplished, virtuous, or half-white. To drop the metaphor, we take Texas with her war slavery, debt, &c., and then pay her travelling expenses, board, tavern, and hotel bills. If there be any other forgotten items—say charge for washing, "mending pantaloons," &c., bring them on. Among the national treasury is open to any and all demands made as the price of Texas Annexation.—*Albany Evening Journal.*

A WIFE.—"When a man says," says Mrs. Moore, "comes to marry, if it is a companion whom he wants, not merely a creature who can paint, and play, and dance, and dance. It is a being who can comfort and counsel, who can reason and reprove, who can judge, and act, and discourse, and discriminate; one who can assist him in his affairs, lighten his cares, soothe his sorrow, purify his joys, strengthen his principles, and educate his children."

## COMMERCIAL.

### LOUISVILLE PRICES CURRENT.

Haggling,	9 @ 10	Bale, 3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> ton,	\$7 1/2
Bale Rope,	3 @ 4 1/2	long—1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> ton,	10
Wool,	5 @ 60 @ 65	Washed, 65 @	100
Beeswax,	25 @ 60	Water,	103 @
Butter—		Lard,	7
Western Reserve, none	Iron—3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> ton—		
Canada,	12 @ 15	Bar,	\$3 1/2
Sperm,	30 @ 32	Sheet, 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> lb., 7	
Mould,		Malacca,	
Star,	30 @ 60	Sugar House,	40 @
Choco,	7 @	Nail, 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> lb.,	4 @
Coal,	8 @ 10	Pork—	
Rice,	71 @ 73	Prime,	12 @
Coff,	71 @ 73	Meal,	120
Gu. Domingo,	61 @ 73		
Havana,	7 @ 8	Kenawha, lots, 21	
Java,	11 @ 13	retail, 23	
Colton,	41 @ 61	Turks Island, 37	
Coco, C. Carns,		Curacao, 41 @	
Crothers,	\$3 50	Seeds—	
Feathers, 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> lb., 25 @ 26		Cloves,	\$3 @
Fish—		Bimby,	50 @
No. 1, 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> lb., 15 @ 15 1/2		Black peas, 50 @	
No. 2, " 12 @ 10		Flax, 1 @ 100 @	
No. 3, " 9 @ 9 1/2		Hemp, 50 @	
Flour—		3 @ 8 @ 9	
Sisal, 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> lb., 3 @ 3 50 @ 3 55		Wool—	
Fruit—		Havana,	11
Apples, green, 1 @ 11		Tabacco—	
dry, 8 @ 11		No. 1, \$3 25 @	
No. 2, 100 @ 105		No. 2, 75 @	
" peeled,	2 50	No. 3, 1 @ 10 @	
Grain—		Wool—	
Wheat, 5 @ 57		Washed, 25 @	
Barley, 30 @ 25		Unwashed, 25 @	
Oats,	33 @ 25		



Then with recruited strength, they re-pur-sue their way towards home. Wheu suddenly, that "sain by which angels fell," masters your soul. You will not longer be a looker on, a mere noontich! You will show them what John Smith can do. You take the spear and balance it. It's wondrous heavy! Then you look into the water, first on this aide, then on that—and you see a fish, fortunately pursuing a straight course, or little to your left—and you cry "on!" You overhaul him fast, and measure the depth of the water with your eye—it is evidently about eight feet. Then, by the way of preparation, you place your self firmly, striding like a colossus, and slip your hand up the spear, just at the right distance, and seize it with a firm grasp. The fish, who has been the flying foe—you give a most powerful thrust, and as it does not reach the bottom by some feet, you are carried, by your own violent act, right out of the boat, head foremost, into fourteen feet water. Up you come again, blowing like a grampus, and are caught by the hair, and pulled in by the shoulders, all wet and shivering. Fortunately you are but half a mile from the boat house—where you are put ashore, and wend your way into the village dripping like a water spaniel, all a-cold and perfectly content to follow Woley's advice and "hing away amhion." S.

An ignorant western man building his ideal forms beside the *chef d'œuvres* of all past time and compelling critics with all their prejudices to adjudge him an equal and fit companion for a Cleomeles, Michael Angelo and Praxiteles, is an anomaly in the history of the human race.

The city of Cincinnati should not let England and Philadelphia and Charleston and New York get all these choice works of Powers. She is showing herself unworthy of the artist she has given the world, and

"Slavery in all its forms is anti-democratic—the natural enemy of the working-man."  
THEODORE SEDGWICK.

TERMS—\$1, paid in advance; \$1.25 paid three  
months after the date of the first number.  
I. W. WARNER,  
In behalf of himself and others.  
Williamsburg, June 25th, 1845.

**BOOK AND PAMPHLET WORK**  
executed neatly and elegantly, at the short-  
price, and upon terms the most liberal, at the  
"American" Office, No. 6, *Mull-street*.  
1845.—[1f

an Cleve & Sewall, Dayton; and by ap- Agents in every town in the State.  
p Detroit, Mich., by J. Owens & Co.  
n Pittsburgh, Pa., by S. Wilcox, Jr.  
22, 1845. 8-3in

work to be published will be a translation French, entitled "The Three Kingdoms, Scotland, Ireland, by the Viscountinecount June 3, 1845.